

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action mailed March 2, 2004. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 21-25 were pending in the Application. Applicant amends Independent Claims 21 and 25. It is important to note that the amendments are not the result of any prior art reference and, thus, do not narrow the scope of any of the claims. Furthermore, the amendments are not related to patentability issues, only further clarify subject matter already present, and have been made only to advance the prosecution of this case. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

In the Drawings

The Examiner identified that FIGURE 1 and FIGURE 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because that which is old is illustrated. Applicant has amended FIGURE 1 and FIGURE 2 to provide this indication and, thereby, resolved the Examiner's concern.

IN THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objects to the title of the invention because it is not descriptive. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant proffers that the current title is descriptive and, furthermore, that it is consistent with M.P.E.P. guidelines. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdrawal this objection.

The Examiner also takes issue with the current abstract of the pending application. Applicant is unable to identify any deficiency in the current abstract. The current abstract is well within the 150-word limit as prescribed by the M.P.E.P. Additionally, the current abstract conforms to all other aspects of M.P.E.P. guidelines concerning abstracts. Thus, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdrawal this objection.

The Examiner objects to the disclosure because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. After evaluating M.P.E.P. (particularly §608), Applicant is confident of the appropriateness of the link. This is not a hyperlink, which would ostensibly direct the Examiner to new subject matter or additional disclosure. Instead, the use of this link has been used for purposes of example only in illustrating a potential location that is sought to be accessed by a given client. Accordingly, this example is consistent with M.P.E.P. guidelines as

they pertain to the use of links in patent application specifications. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdrawal this objection.

#### Section 112 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner further rejects to Claims 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has addressed the Examiner's concerns with a number of amendments to Independent Claims 21 and 25. This rejection is now moot in light of the amendments and, therefore, should be withdrawn.

#### Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 21-25 of the present application are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4-10, 24, and 41 of U.S. Patent No. 6,260,070. Applicant has addressed the Examiner's concerns with a number of amendments to Independent Claims 21 and 25. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn.

All of the claims are now in condition for immediate allowance. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested by Applicant in the form of a full allowance of the pending claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clear and apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.


Applicant believes that no fee is due. If this is not correct the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact its attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicant

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas J. Frame  
Reg. No. 47,232

Dated: June 1, 2004

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 75201-2980  
(214) 953-6675

Customer Number: **05073**